

ALAN WATT BLURB
"RELIGION, ROSY CROSS, REFORMATION,
REVOLUTION AND WORLD REPUBLIC
(CAPITALIZING COMMUNISM
"FOR THE THIRD WAY")"
March 7, 2007

**Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - March 7, 2007 (Exempting
Music and Literary Quotes)**

WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM

www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

Hi, folks. I'm Alan Watt at cuttingthroughthematrix.com. Today is Wednesday the 7th of March 2007.

I've had more snow in the last week and a half than I've had all winter and I think they've probably changed their formulas—the alchemists in the sky, the great Disneyland that's above our heads now, so they've combined different mixtures to give us some snow, which I'm not complaining about because in this region everything's adapted to a fair bit of snow, all the plant life and trees and so on, and they'll need that in the summer and unfortunately too so will the mosquitoes, because the more moisture there is in spring in the ground the more they will thrive. Who invented all this stuff, the mosquitoes in this paradise, eh? Strange sense of humor.

Tonight, I was thinking about talking a little bit about how religion and the state not only have always been one, but how once one part of it has served its purpose it transforms into what appears to be something new but really isn't at all. It's perhaps more efficient in controlling peoples minds.

We must remember that not so long ago—the world is so old and humanity has been around for a long, long time that it's difficult for most people to get outside that little box, which is their own life, their personal journey, and understand how people lived not so long ago, partly because we are so separated with the generations now intentionally. It's much easier to control people if you can separate great-grandma and pa (granny and grandpa) and even today, mother and father from the child. This was not only discussed at huge meetings over 100 years ago, well over 100 years ago, but it's been implemented. It's been made to be, not by happenstance.

However, not so long ago, really, before the revolutions begun with the new Rosicrucian Kabbalistic Masonic societies which openly came out in the 1500's, before that, theocracy ruled by religion was the norm. The Vatican had a monopoly over a massive part of the world. They appointed kings. They allowed kings to continue as long as they behaved themselves and gave obedience to the religion itself. They had to follow a certain amount of orders. Once in a while, a

king would turn against the Vatican and they'd have their tiff and they'd be excommunicated and the king couldn't get to heaven. Those kings generally didn't care so much and sometimes were forgiven and brought back into the fold with a little bit of repentance.

WHAT YOU ARE TAUGHT FROM YOUR CHILDHOOD BECOMES YOUR REALITY.

Nothing new in the science of how to control. In a world where people were allowed to find out everything for themselves, and really when you think about it, if you're born and not owned by anyone, the state or otherwise, you could be allowed, you could learn everything that you wanted to learn for yourself and be so vastly different from the people we see around us, including yourselves, to find out everything that we wanted to know, by ourselves, by institution, by following. Our opinions would be vastly, vastly different from the indoctrinated, accepted, authorized opinions and theories and so on that we've all swallowed.

Therefore, the church was always very important. At one time it was predominate over kings and queens. For a while around the 1500's the kings were almost on an equal par basis with power and then of course we had what was called the Lutheran Revolution. Revolutions are very important—the turning, the going around—planned of course, because no system or structure can stand on its own forever. Therefore, it must transform or have an enemy or something to oppose it. When a state religion just like a country is opposed, those within the country, even if they're abused or within the religion, will cling closer to those in authority over them. Therefore, war, threats of war and all that are very important for maintaining control over people.

Carl Gustav Jung came on the scene at the same time as Freud when this really relatively early exoteric form of psychiatry and psychology were announced to the world and Carl Gustav Jung differed with Freud in many, many aspects. Freud's job was basically to attempt to have us individually give up any thought that human life in a sense was sacred. We're just a form of animal, higher animal, which can be reshaped. We're just conditioned reflexes and responses and all that kind of stuff to things that happened in our childhood and our family arrangement, that we adopted all the good parts and all the bad parts. We copied behavior. We're products of our environment; and there was nothing more to it and therefore if you were not sacred in a sense you were like plastic or plasticine. You were just a building material, where professionals like Freud himself would come in and experiment on you to alter you into something which he would want to create, more perfect in his eyes.

I'm going to read a little bit from Jung who opposed, because of his own experiences; he opposed the completely atheistic mundane view of Freud. He knew there was more to the human psyche than just conditioned responses and a bunch of neurons in the brain. That doesn't make you *you* and no matter how many degrees you string together in the pseudo sciences and various pseudo sciences all combining together and behaviorism and how you respond to psychology and study, doesn't alter reality, although they'd like to. They certainly would like to. It might sound very impressive, but it doesn't necessarily mean it's true.

You'll always find that down through history you find dominant groups rising and

falling as new ones come up and their first thing to do is to take over the power over the people because the only ones who produce anything to keep everybody at the top in comfort are the masses at the bottom. That's just the history of the world. It's a form of slavery, pure and simple. You can keep changing the terms and call societies by different names, but if it looks like a duck and walks like a duck and quacks like a duck it's a duck you see.

This little bit is from Carl Jung talking about religion as the counter-balance to mass mindedness. When he wrote this the Cold War was supposedly on and the Soviet system and he wasn't in on the big overall plan, I know that, and to him the Cold War was very real. However, he did describe the Soviet system very well. Now we know the Soviet system is now combined with the capitalist system to make the third way, where they combine the bureaucracies of the Soviet style government and with the fascism of an ultra-dominant elite, very rich at the top, and it's to get much, much worse. It's getting worse all the time. Let's be honest.

This is what he says about religions that counter-balance to mass mindedness.

"In order to free the fiction of the sovereign state -- in other words, the whims of those who manipulate it -- from every wholesome restriction, all socio-political movements tending in this direction invariably try to cut the ground from under the religions. For, in order to turn the individual into a function of the State, his dependence on anything beside the State must be taken from him. But religion means dependence on and submission to the irrational facts of experience. These do not refer directly to social and physical conditions; they concern far more the individual psychic attitude."

Alan: By psychic he's talking about the wholesome, the complete you, the total you, your mind, personality, everything.

"But it is possible to have an attitude to the external conditions of life only when there is a point of reference outside them. The religions give, or claim to give, such a standpoint, thereby enabling the individual to exercise his judgment and his power of decision. They build up reserve, as it were, against the obvious and the inevitable force of circumstances to which everyone is exposed who lives only in the outer world and has no other ground under his feet except the pavement. If statistical reality is the only reality, then it is the sole authority."

Alan: Now that's a very important statement that's been echoed by others since. "If statistical reality is the only reality, then it is the sole authority." Statistics and the game of statistics is a trick learned from religion, only upgraded to a better version. We can say, well there's lies, then there's damn lies (meaning more intricate lies) and then there are statistics. Well, statistics pretend to hide behind the guise of science and we're trained and conditioned that science is the new priesthood and whatever they say must be true and they use statistics to convince us.

The longer you live the more you will see little bits coming out in newspapers and

over the media where scientific institutions come out with new theories all the time, often contradicting the last theory that was held as the gospel truth the last 10, 20 years, and they never notice—they never mention or make a deal like "we're taking the opposite view now and this is now the gospel truth," and they always use statistics to verify every version they give you. Statistics are very useful in conditioning people, especially the mass man who doesn't want to stand out like a sore thumb from everyone else.

"There is then only one condition and since no contrary condition exists, judgment and decision are not only superfluous but impossible. Then the individual is bound to be a function of statistics and hence a function of the State or whatever the abstract principle of order may be called."

Alan: Abstract principle of order.

"The religions, however, teach another authority opposed to that of the "world." The doctrine of the individual's dependence on God makes just as high a claim upon him as the world does. It may even happen with the absoluteness of this claim estranges him from the world in the same way he is estranged from himself when he succumbs to the collective mentality. He can forfeit his judgment and power of decision in the former case (for the sake of religious doctrine) quite as much as in the latter. This is the goal the religions openly aspire to unless they compromise with the State. When they do, I prefer to call them not "religions" but "creeds."

Alan: Very important part of this.

"A creed gives expression to a definite collective belief, whereas the word religion expresses a subjective relationship to certain metaphysical extramundane factors. A creed is a confession of faith intended chiefly for the world at large and is thus an intramundane affair, while the meaning and purpose of religion lie in the relationship of the individual to God"

Alan: That's in the Western Hemisphere.

"(Christianity, Judaism, Islam) or to the path of salvation and liberation such as in Buddhism. From this basic fact, all ethics is derived which without the individual's responsibility before God can be called nothing more than conventional morality."

Alan: So a creed is something you're born into, it's an accepted form of collective rituals that have built up over a long, long period of time. It becomes custom and tradition, mainly tradition, and the initial fire that is instilled is doused—it is gone under ritualism, custom and social doctrine which comes into it.

The liberating factor is gone and those people conform to the State system because their churches are registered and authorized by the State. They also have a lot of rules to follow. They can't talk about certain subjects

AND a list is given to them by the State if they are tax-exempt. Nothing is free in this world, nothing in this system.

"From this basic fact, all ethics is derived which without the individual's responsibility before God can be called nothing more than conventional reality."

Alan: See, that's what the creeds end up doing. You have conventional morality custom et cetera.

"Since they are compromises with mundane reality, the creeds have accordingly seen themselves obliged to undertake a progressive codification of their views, doctrines and customs and in so doing have externalized themselves to such an extent that the authentic religious element in them--the living relationship to and direct confrontation with their extramundane point of reference has been thrust into the background. The denominational standpoint measures the worth and importance of the subjective religious relationship by the yardstick of traditional doctrine, and where this is not so frequent as in Protestantism, one immediately hears talk of pietism, sectarianism, eccentricity, and so forth, as soon as anyone claims to be guided by God's will. A creed coincides with the established church, or at any rate, forms a public institution whose members include not only true believers but vast numbers of people who can only be described as "indifferent" in matters of religion and who belong to it simply by force of habit. Here the difference between a creed and a religion become palpable.

To the adherent of a creed, therefore, is not always a religious matter but more often a social one and, as such, does nothing to give the individual a foundation. For support, he has to depend exclusively on his relation to an authority which is not of this world. The criterion here is not lip service to a creed but the psychological fact that the life of the individual is not determined solely by the ego and its opinions or by social factors, but quite as much, if not more by a transcendent authority. It is not ethical principles, however, lofty or creeds, however orthodox, that lay the foundations for the freedom and anatomy of the individual but simply and solely the empirical awareness, the incontrovertible experience of intensely personal, reciprocal relationship between man and an extramundane authority which acts as a counterpoise to the "world" and its "reason.

This formulation will not please either the mass man or the collective believer. For the former the policy of the State is the supreme principle of thought and action. Indeed, this was the purpose for which he was enlightened, and accordingly the mass man grants the individual a right to exist only in so far as the individual is a function of the State. The believer, on the other hand, while admitting that the State has a moral and factual claim, confesses to the belief that not only man but the State that rules his is subject to the overlordship of "God" and that, in case of doubt, the supreme decision will be made by God and not by the State. Since I do not presume to metaphysical

judgment, I must leave it an open question where the world," i.e., that is the phenomenal world of man and hence nature in general is the "opposite" of God or not. I can only point to the fact that the psychological opposition between these two realms of experience is not only vouched for in the New Testament but is still exemplified very plainly today in the negative attitude of the dictator states to religion and of the church to atheism and materialism."

Alan: He's showing you the dialectic between science which is the new religion and like all religions to be supreme they must be absolute and they demand absolute obeisance. We see that with inoculations trying to get forced through from what were recently and some are still called "health services."

Well, since when does a service dictate to you? And I'll tell you when it dictates to you, is when it's had a period where we have never stopped and told them to get off our backs, because the longer we allow things the more dictatorial they become. That's the nature of the bully and there is no satisfying the bully; no matter how much you grovel, there's no satisfying them. They demand more and more. That's what power is all about.

"Just as man, as a social being, cannot in the long run exist without a tie to the community--"

Alan: Now that doesn't speak for everyone.

"So the individual will never find the real justification for his existence, and his own spiritual and moral autonomy, anywhere except in the extramundane principle capable of relativizing the overpowering influence of external factors. The individual who is not anchored in God can offer no resistance on his own resources to the physical and moral blandishments of the world. For this he needs the evidence of inner transcendent experience which alone can protect him from the otherwise inevitable submersion in the mass. Merely intellectual or even moral insight into the stultification and moral irresponsibility of the mass man is a negative recognition only and amounts to not much more than a wavering on the road to the atomization of the individual. It lacks the driving force of religious conviction since it is merely rational. The dictator State has one great advantage over bourgeois reason."

Alan: Now, bourgeois is the old term for "middle class" that they used to use in the communist sector, so this is the great advantage it has over the middle class reason.

"Along with the individual it swallows up his religious forces. The State has taken the place of God; that is why seen from this angle, the socialist dictatorships are religions and State slavery is a form of worship. But the religious function cannot be dislocated and falsified in this way without giving rise to secret doubts, which are immediately repressed so as to avoid conflict with the prevailing trend towards mass-mindedness."

Alan: That's what we see in George Orwell's "**1984**," we see the conflicts that Winston goes through and that they all go through. It's almost like being in a computer program where you're always being updated with new data and you're supposed to just go along with it and change direction at the whim of the State.

"The result, as always in such cases, is overcompensation in the form of fanaticism, which in its turn is used as a weapon for stamping out the least flicker of opposition."

Alan: He's talking here about when the State becomes God. Now remember, in the completely mundane, the worldly, the scientific system which has its own religion. It is a religion, on evolution on all this kind of stuff that's never been proven either. You take an awful lot of faith to believe in evolution. He's telling you that if you believe in nothing more than a collection of cells with conditioned responses that can be altered through behavioral psychology and repetition and all of that, then the State can do with you as they see fit; because if they claim you're abnormal, they then have the right to normalize you according to the dictates of the State. And like all gods, you see, the State when it becomes God can have no other gods before it, so they will not stand for any other point of view or rationale as to who you are and what your duties to the State are. They will not stand for any opposition.

In fact, it's worse than religion. Religion, for all of its horrors, and they had plenty built into it, at least showed you the hypocrisy because they didn't even follow their own dictates of the books that they supposedly followed. There was no compassion in the horror shows that they brought on, but least the writings were still contained for the few to say, "wait a minute here. Why are they going around burning and slaughtering people?" Whereas with the State, there will be no literature given out to oppose what they're doing.

"Free opinion in the mass State is stifled and moral decision ruthlessly suppressed on the plea that the end justifies the means, even the vilest. The policy of the State is exalted to a creed. The leader or party boss becomes a demigod beyond good and evil and his votaries are honored as heroes, martyrs, apostles, missionaries. There is only one truth and beside it no other. It is sacrosanct and above criticism. Anyone who thinks differently is a heretic, who, as we know from history is threatened with all manner of unpleasant things. Only the party boss who holds the political power in his hands can interpret the State doctrine authentically and he does so just as suits him."

Alan: This should be ringing little alarm bells in people's minds when they see what we're going through today and they remember the laws and so on being imposed, all very ominous to something to come.

"When, through mass rule, the individual becomes social unit number so-and-so."

Alan: Now remember that.

"When, through mass rule, the individual becomes social unit number so-and-so."

Alan: Whatever your number is that you've been given.

"and the State is elevated to the supreme principle, it is only to be expected that the religious function too will be sucked into the maelstrom. Religion, as the careful observation and taking account of certain invisible and uncontrollable factors, is an instinctive attitude, peculiar to man and its manifestations can be followed all through human history. Its evident purpose is to maintain the psychic balance, for the natural man has an equally natural "knowledge" of the fact that his conscious functions may at anytime be thwarted by uncontrollable happenings coming from inside as well as from outside. For this reason he's always taken care that any difficult decision likely to have consequences for himself and others shall be rendered safe by suitable measures of a religious nature.

Offerings are made to the invisible powers, formidable blessings are pronounced and all kinds of solemn rites are performed. Everywhere and at all times there've have been rites d'entrée et de sortie whose magical efficacy is denied and which are impugned as magic and superstition by rationalists and capable of psychological insight. But magic has above all a psychological effect whose importance should not be underestimated. The performance of a "magical" action gives the person concerned a feeling of security which is absolutely essential for carrying out a decision, because a decision is inevitably somewhat one-sided and is therefore rightly felt to be a risk.

Even a dictator thinks it necessary not only to accompany his acts of State with threats but to stage them with all manner of solemnities. Brass bands, flags, banners parades and monster demonstrations are no different in principle from ecclesiastical processions, cannonades and fireworks to scare off demons. Only, the suggestive parade of State power engenders a collective feeling of security which, unlike religious demonstrations, gives the individual no protection against his inner demonism. Hence he will cling all the more to the power of the State that is to the mass, thus delivering himself up to it psychically as well as morally and putting the finishing touch to his social depotentialization. The State, like the Church, demands enthusiasm, self-sacrifice and love if religion requires or presupposes "the fear of God," then the dictator State takes good care to provide the necessary terror.

When the rationalist directs the main force of his attack against the magical effect of the rite as asserted by tradition, he has in reality completely missed the mark. The essential point, the psychological effect, is overlooked, although both parties make use of it for directly opposite purposes. A similar situation prevails with regard to their respective conceptions of the goals. The goals of religion such as deliverance from evil, reconciliation with God, rewards in the hereafter and so on turn into worldly promises about freedom from

care for one's daily bread, the just distribution of material goods, universal prosperity and shorter working hours. That the fulfillment of these promises is as far off as paradise only it furnishes yet another analogy and underlines the fact that the masses have been converted from an extramundane role to a purely worldly belief which is extolled with exactly the same religious fervor and exclusiveness that the creeds display in the other direction.

In order not to repeat myself unnecessarily, I shall not enumerate all the parallels between worldly and other worldly beliefs, but shall content myself with emphasizing the fact that a natural function which has existed from the beginning, like the religious function, cannot be disposed of with rationalistic and so-called enlightened criticism. You can, of course, the doctrinal contents of the creeds as impossible and subject them to ridicule, but such methods miss the point and do not hit the religious function which forms the basis of the creeds. Religion, in the sense of conscientious regard for the irrational factors of the psyche and individual fate, reappears evilly distorted in the deification of the State and the dictator: *Naturam expellas furca tamen usque recurret* (you can throw out Nature with a pitchfork, but she'll always turn up again). The leaders and dictators, having weighed up the situation correctly, are therefore doing their best to gloss over the all too obvious parallel with the deification of Caesar and to hide their real power behind the fiction of the State, though this, of course, alters nothing.

As I have already pointed out, the dictator State, besides robbing the individual of his rights, has also cut the ground from under his feet psychically by depriving him of the metaphysical foundations of his existence. The ethical decision of the individual human being no longer counts-- what alone matters is the blind movement of the masses, and the lie has thus become the operative principle of political action. The State has drawn the logical conclusions from this as the existence of many millions of State slaves completely deprived of all rights mutely testifies."

Alan: He was talking then about the communist system. We saw that in China too. He's saying that you can try and crush out obeisance to one master but it must transform and simply obey the new master in a similar way, with a similar fanaticism if need be. That's why horror intensifies as it ping-palls between one form and the other, from religion which is the worship of whatever deity they've given you, to the State itself when you worship the State. The only difference being with religion and most religions you'll find there's some kind of empathy for victims once in a while, mixed with all the hatred for those who oppose them, and that's true too, but there's always some kind of mercy here and there. With the State, which is law, there's none.

"Both the dictator State and denominational religion lay quite particular emphasis on the idea of community."

Alan: Now this is very important because now we see it's come together. We've see the capitalism and communism had the same goals all along because they

were invented by the same people as a dialectic.

"Both the dictator State and denominational religion lay quite particular emphasis on the idea of community. This is the basic ideal of "communism," and it is thrust down the throats of the people so much that it has the exact opposite of the desired effect: it inspires divisive mistrust. The Church, which is no less emphasized, appears on the other side as a communal ideal,"

Alan: It's an ideal, not a reality.

"and where the Church is notoriously weak, as in Protestantism, the hope of or belief in a "communal experience" makes up for the painful lack of cohesion."

Alan: And that's what the Protestants think too, that it's a mass rising from the grave and up they go and they're all safe and that's it and Billy Graham's on the vanguard leading the charge with a big flag.

"the hope of or belief in a "communal experience" makes up for the painful lack of cohesion. As can easily be seen, "community" is an indispensable aid in the organization of masses and is therefore a two-edged weapon. Just as the addition of however many zeroes will never make a unit, so the value of a community depends on a spiritual and moral stature of the individuals composing it. For this reason one cannot expect from the community any effect that would outweigh the suggestive influence of the environment—that is, a real and fundamental change in individuals, whether for good or for bad. Such changes can come only from the personal encounter between man and man, but not from communistic or Christian baptisms en masse, which do not touch the inner man. How superficial the effect of communal propaganda actually is can be seen from recent events in Eastern Europe."

Alan: That was a while ago.

"The communal ideal reckons without its host, overlooking the individual human being, who in the end will assert his claims."

Alan: Now the elite know that the individual would have to assert his claims and that's the rush on for the totalitarian system we're now into, where everyone's watched and monitored and ultimately will get all chipped. They know this. They know what Jung's talking about because they have all these professionals and large boards and committees employed full-time working on this kind of strategy. They understand that you cannot suppress the individual past a certain point; then he must reassert himself. It's nature but they know this and remember what he said about community. In **Agenda 21**, which every country has pretty well has signed, they talk and talk about the community. Communitarianism is what George Bush, Sr. called it and that is what he said he would promote.

Now this is the habitat area idea, where we'll all be appointed our tasks, or we sit

and make beads at the side of the road and sell them to tourists or whatever they dream up for us, and you see it through all advertising because advertising is not there simply to market ideas into your head. That's a big part of it, but the marketing companies are tied intricately with governments and they market new ideas which the government points out to them they want them to take and you'll hear that with so many big companies now. The big building companies and all that that's like factories where everything is on racks and you walk in and it's just a huge factory in a sense and their advertising will tell you they're part of your community. Really, really? They're part of your community. Well what is a community? A bunch of stores demanding you buy their stuff. In fact, killing off all the other little stores around them and once they're out of the way then they jack their price up; so undercut first, then put them out of business and jack up the prices. It's the oldest game in the book, but they're part of your community.

The **Agenda 21**, **UN agenda** is the agenda for the 21st century where ultimately we'll all gradually be put into these communal communities and habitat areas, where we'll no doubt grow up like a bunch of vegetables, different kinds of vegetables and be appointed your particular dish. That's where you go and that's where you go and this is what you do, and it's a wonderful prospect where this world of experts will create this beautiful utopia and this is what they have planned and that's what everything is working towards.

You'll find all the political correct crew who start politics with the little boards of charity that they join and try climbing their way up the ladder. They don't give a darn about the charities or anything else. They fill their pockets. They learn how to play the game of politics. Who to get to meet. What to say. What not to say. What to ask. What not to ask. What Masonic groups to join and how to always kiss the feet of the guy whose the chairman of your little charity group because he's the guy that gives the wink and the nod to put you elsewhere once he's vetted you. However, they parrot all this stuff. They hear the terms. They know this is the in-thing that they want to hear and they parrot all these phrases like robots. If you ever hear a bureaucrats speaking to each other, all they're doing is exchanging all their conditioned parrot phrases between each other; and standing outside of it all and looking at it is quite entertaining, although it does get boring.

This is the world we live in. It's a planned world where communism with the techniques that they used and experimented on on the masses have now been submerged with capitalism, communism and massive bureaucracies will run the world. It's already happened. It's done and man's inhumanity to man is standard display itself what has for a long time because bureaucracies are the greatest weapon to destroy those at the bottom. That's why Hitler and all of the staff that worked for him, the bureaucrats, could go through numbers and figures and statistics because they were depersonalized. They weren't people anymore. They were numbers and statistics. The bureaucrat's been far, far removed from the camps and the same thing happened in the Soviet system with their massive bureaucracy where they sent them off to various camps within Siberia and starved them, killed them, beat them, shot them. Same thing. There's not difference at all whatsoever.

All the experience that was gained and both of them was put together into the one and all governments learned it and CIA did and MI6 did and they all learned all this stuff, because to them the control of the masses is tremendous data. It's data

which they crave, how it's all done. They never destroy knowledge. They simply keep it from the public.

What Jung was talking about the metaphysical aspect, he's not talking about pulling cards out and reading the stars or anything like that. He's talking about a basic need within people to at least know or touch or feel something which is outside the control of the power or the powers in this world. It's a balance for health. It's often the balance to a crisis that keeps a person going. Of course all the sharks get in on it too with their promises of selling experiences or telling your fortune. This is all ancient again too – that's another show, another few shows, in fact; but he's talking about a metaphysical unverifiable thing which only the individual themselves or himself or herself can experience; so much so, that you can't simply hand it to someone else. It wouldn't mean anything to them and certainly not the same. It's your own experiences that come or matter to you for you. That is your way of being mentally healthy or psychically healthy or call it what you want without having wars over words.

What he's really pointing out is that a world hell-bent on political bureaucratic and scientific institutions will oppose no – they'll have no position. No other gods before them and they will be crueler and far worse than even all the religions that have gone before with all their persecutions, because in the State doctrine where the State is God there is nothing written in their books that says they must have compassion or mercy. Just like someone who's gone out of control, they'll go through a frenzy of fury destroying whatever is in their path until they're physically exhausted and they can create an awful lot of damage in the process, so will the State with all its might and power. It would bring us all to a standstill eventually and themselves, an utter show before it was exhausted and it would take exhaustion to stop them. Fanaticism has an ugly, ugly face.

Now Carl Jung himself had his own personal experiences which some would call metaphysical and that's what made him stand up against Freud who was completely atheistic. At least that's what he pretended to be and he had to, for his role was to convince the public that we're just a blob of protoplasm and cells with in-built codings et cetera that can be manipulated and we're very malleable and we can be perfected to serve the system.

This book is worth a read, remembering that Jung could also lose himself in what was and still is an infant doctrine. I shouldn't even call it a doctrine really because it really is put together with way too many theories, way too many mistakes which have been proven, but it was at least an attempt to understand some things with which make up us. Unfortunately, if you explain what humanity is or an individual is, you're showing up the weaknesses for those who will exploit society; and psychiatry is in bed with totalitarianism. It has been from the beginning. Psychiatry was decided a long time ago to be used as one of the major tools, along with psychology and behaviorism, for creating a new world, a new type of society. More obedient, placid functional utilitarian type society using their new sciences of understanding how we operate.

All learning gets abused. Pandora's box is open and those who are in power always exploit and their first job is to maintain themselves in power. Since we live in a dog-eat-dog society based on money, an accumulation of money, which also means that those who have no money have a terror of being utterly poor and destitute

and that's really instilled in everyone. We have an over compensation within people to get to the top, so they have way more then they'd ever need and they destroy other lives in the process of getting up there and that's called "being successful," in this crazy old world.

I'm thankful to the people who email me. I don't answer all the emails. I can't, there's too many. I flag them to reply to later and I never get round to them. I often unplug the phone now because I can't sit and live on the phone and eat and do all the things I have to do, but I do read them and there are a lot of people out there all over the world, generally isolated from each other, who understand what I'm talking about. They also understand that I'm not necessarily telling them that you're going to have some other kind of utopia.

I'm just stating things as they are and yet from understanding all of this you can escape a tremendous burden of uncertainty and anxiety because those things come from the lack of understanding. You're reacting to things which make no sense to you. When they do make sense to you, a lot of that worry goes and you regain a respect for yourself and you stop blaming yourself for whatever. For failed marriages, for whatever it is that's your big hang-up. Most marriages don't have a snowflake's chance in hell, deliberately so because they targeted the sexes a long time ago to separate them so they can't get on for a long period of time. That was all deliberate, the destruction of the family unit, all written down in the Communist Manifesto, the different planks. Look at them all. They've all been completed and as was intended, the two paths join, capitalism and communism, for the next part of the show.

I hope I've given you some things to ponder. You can always get Jung's book, "***The Undiscovered Self***" this one's called. "***The Undiscovered Self***" where he scratches the surface and he didn't know it all himself, but at least he tried to put candidly forth views which were not well accepted by his own supposed profession and it takes a bit of courage at least to go against the mass in any time, any era, in any situation.

For me and Hamish, it's good night and may your god or your gods but definitely not your doctrine go with you.

"As Long As We Stand"
By Melanie

I'll be your companion
Your lover and friend
It's all I can promise
It's all that anyone can

But the world - it was flat once
And now it is round
And love is forever
'Til one lover falls down

But as long as we stand
Just as long as we stand
We'll be together

As long as we stand

I bring this love with me
If I go, it will remain
A gift that brings pleasure
Can leave so much pain

But if form follows function
Then it's understood
The body is stone
And the heart is made of wood

But as long as we stand
For the heart and the soul of the living man
We'll be together

As long as we stand, as we stand
Just as long as we stand
We'll be together
As long as we stand

And the world gets hard
The world gets hard and cold
We got to answer back with our hearts
With our hearts and our souls

I have a dream
As long as we stand
As long as we stand
As we stand

The planet was whole - it was clean, it was good
'Til evil met the notion of boundaries and gold
And mankind grew watchful, we still hear the sound
From when someone got nervous and shot another man down

But as long as we stand
Just as long as we stand
As long as we stand
As long as we stand
We'll be together

(Transcribed by Linda)